

BR225.N66 1996  
The non-Chalcedonian heretics :

ST. VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY LIBRARY  
575 SCARSDALE ROAD  
CRESTWOOD, TUCKAHOE, NY 10707

MONOGRAPHIC SUPPLEMENT SERIES  
NUMBER XVII

Holy Monastery of Saint Gregory  
(Monastery of Gregoriou)  
Mount Athos, Greece

## THE NON-CHALCEDONIAN HERETICS

A Contribution to the Dialogue  
Concerning the "Orthodoxy" of  
the Non-Chalcedonians

Second Edition

Translated by  
Archbishop Chrysostomos of Etna  
and Hieromonk Patapios



CENTER FOR TRADITIONALIST  
ORTHODOX STUDIES

Etna, California 96027

1996

A Monographic Supplement to  
*Orthodox Tradition* (ISSN 0742-4019)  
Copyright 1995 by  
Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies

### Publisher's Foreword

The Copts, Jacobites, and other Non-Chalcedonian heretics, the "Oriental Orthodox," have been separated from the Orthodox Church since the earliest Christian centuries. Of late, under the rubrics of ecumenical politics, the serious theological differences which separate these heretical confessions from the Orthodox Church have been dismissed as a matter of "semantics"; their condemnation by the Fathers and Synods of the Church has been called into question; and their piety (something which we do not dispute, since our concern is the correct confession of the Faith, not personal integrity) has been cited as a justification for receiving Non-Chalcedonian believers into Orthodox communion. Indeed, parishes of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, the Orthodox Church in America, and the Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese routinely commune Copts and other Monophysites. The Patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria have not only turned a blind eye to this blasphemy, but have knowingly allowed—and later denied—instances of concelebration with various Non-Chalcedonian heretics.

Though the Abbots of the major monasteries on the Holy Mountain have largely capitulated to the threats of Constantinople against any protests directed at the Patriarchate's betrayal of the Faith through ecumenism, the Monastery of Saint Gregory (Gregoriou) did issue a very significant paper on the theological dialogues between the Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonian Churches. In an atmosphere of misrepresentation, denial, and betrayal by the "official" Orthodox Patriarchates, and in the face of misinformation designed to obfuscate the Faith-destroying errors of the Non-Chalcedonian heretics, we have deemed it worthwhile to print the words of a famous Athonite monastery on this matter, the words of monks who are, however heavy and burdened their consciences are because of it, in communion with the very Patriarchates which are leading our Faithful into communion with heretics who have been consistently condemned by our Orthodox Fathers and who, even today, under the guise of politics, hide their absolute commitment to the heresies of their forefathers.

## Prologue

In a statement by the Monastery's Sacred Council regarding dialogues between our One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Orthodox Church and the Non-Chalcedonians (often called, improperly, "Eastern Orthodox"), we expressed serious disquietude about the haste shown in moving towards immediate union, without there being essential and necessary provisions for it.

In that brief text, it was not possible to explain why, in our minds, the assertion contained in the Joint Statement [of the Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians]—that is, that all of the Non-Chalcedonians were Orthodox, remaining "...always faithful to the same authentic, Orthodox Christological confession and...Apostolic Tradition," and that, like them, their contemporary successors are also Orthodox—is not correct.

We considered it necessary to investigate this momentous question, which we entrusted to a brother of our Holy Monastery, Hieromonk Luke. We thank Father Luke for his labor, as well as the brothers who assisted him.

We do not lay claim to infallibility. Humbly, we express our perturbation and proffer occasion for further investigation of these serious questions, which merit elucidation, if union is to be established on the firm foundation of Truth.

*The Abbot of the Holy Monastery of  
Saint Gregory, Mount Athos  
† Archimandrite George  
Sunday of the Myrrh-Bearing Women, 1994*

## Introduction

The Second Joint Declaration of the Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians came to the conclusion that both parties have always held the same authentic Faith in the Person of Christ and proclaimed this conclusion as follows:

In the light of our Joint Declaration on Christology, as well as the foregoing joint statements, we now clearly understand that both of our [Orthodox ecclesiastical] families have always held faithfully to the same authentic, Orthodox Christological confession and the uninterrupted continuity of Apostolic Tradition, although they have used Christological terms in a divergent manner. This common Faith and continual fidelity to Apostolic Tradition must be the basis for our unity and communion.<sup>1</sup>

Already the Council of the Sacred Community of Mount Athos, which dealt with the issue of dialogue in one of its Declarations,<sup>2</sup> has set forth ten points: reservations with regard to the ecclesiological presuppositions, procedural integrity, and conclusions of the union dialogues. It also pointed to certain dogmatic matters which demand clarification and clearer formulation. And finally, it addressed the danger of new schisms in the Holy Body of Christ, the Church, if union is not accomplished within the Truth.

Our impression, that it is not possible for the Non-Chalcedonians to have the same Christology as the Orthodox, is supported by a foundational ecclesiological principle, according to which only the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, *viz.*, the Orthodox Church, can possess the fullness of the Truth. For this reason, we proceeded to study the subject of Non-Chalcedonian Christians and to bring into focus their dogmatic divergencies from Orthodoxy. The issues set forth for study were divided into the following three categories: 1) ecclesiological presuppositions; 2) the historical witness; and 3) dogmatic differences.

As for the "Orthodoxy" of the ancient Non-Chalcedonians, the decisions of the Œcumenical Synods and the views of the Holy Fathers leave us no room for a variant position on them, that is, that they are

heretics. Given this stance, the present study does not examine anew whether the Non-Chalcedonians are Orthodox, but attempts to pinpoint their heresy. Since, however, the Joint Statements of the Joint Theological Commission for Theological Dialogue with the Non-Chalcedonians, signed by the representatives of the local Most Holy Orthodox Churches, consider the contemporary Non-Chalcedonians to be of an Orthodox mind, at the end of the present study we shall also express certain thoughts about the possibility of their being Orthodox. And, though we consider positive the fact that the Non-Chalcedonians have already taken some steps in the direction of Orthodoxy, with the delineation of the concerns that we have expressed in this study, we have perhaps come upon an *intra*-Orthodox problematic, one indispensable to any mellowing of the Church's conscience with regard to the union of the Non-Chalcedonians with the Church.

### I. Ecclesiological Presuppositions

A. The One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, that is, the Orthodox Church, is "the pillar and ground of the Truth" (1 Timothy 3:15). It is impossible to confess the Christian Faith truly and fully, save in the Orthodox Church alone. How, then, can we Orthodox acknowledge the Truth of the Faith in places other than the Church?

B. The Church is conscious of Her identity over time. In dialogues with the Non-Chalcedonians, She remains aware that She is the Church of the Holy Apostles and the Holy Fathers of the Seven Œcumenical Synods. The Church's decisions also carry force across time; and for this reason, the decisions of the Holy Fourth Œcumenical Synod are of such binding character that the Church can make no disparate decisions without refuting Herself.

In keeping with this spirit, the phrase, "We now clearly understand..." has no place among Orthodox. The classical Patristic *dictum*, "Following the Holy Fathers..." is the only one which expresses how Orthodox understand themselves.

C. We hear it said, today, that one must not use so-called "polemical" theological nomenclature, that is, the language with which the Holy Fathers refute and controvert the heretics, but a theological language that flows forth from the Church's struggle for the preservation of the unity of the Ecclesiastical Body.<sup>3</sup>

We do not believe that the present theological engagement of heretics outside the Church serves the Truth. First, because the language of the Church with regard to heretics has always been, since Apostolic times, refutative: "Better, indeed, a laudable war than a peace which severs one from God" (Saint Gregory the Theologian). This stand of the Church is actually charitable, for it both protects the Flock of Christ from heresy and provides heretics with motives and reasons for returning to the Church.

Let it be noted, in passing, that the Ecclesiastical Body is comprised of Baptized Orthodox Christians, and of them alone. The preservation of the unity of the Ecclesiastical Body means, consequently, the ensuring of their Orthodoxy and their perseverance to the end within the bosom of the Church; and this precisely constitutes an important part of the the Church's pastoral concern. We do not include within the Ecclesiastical Body, however, heretics outside the Church. The struggle and the concern of the Church reach even to them, but the intent of that struggle is their return to the Church and not the devising by contrived means of peaceful co-existence with them under some nebulous kind of ecclesiastical communion.

### II. The Historical Witness

A. Union attempts in the past.

When attempts at union have been made according to Orthodox criteria, the Church requested of the Non-Chalcedonians that they recognize the Fourth Œcumenical Synod and, in general, an Orthodox confession.

With regard to attempts at union with the Armenians:



[Saint] Photios...wrote to the leader of the Armenians, Asoutios, and their patriarch, Zachariah, urging them to recognize the Fourth Œcumenical Synod....

Patriarch Nicholas Mystikos wrote to the Armenian leader, Sebatios, the son of Asoutios, urging him to accept an Orthodox confession; ...but a new leader, Asoutios the Younger (913–925), ...put an end to relations between the two Churches....

The Emperor of Constantinople, Manuel Comnenos, exchanged letters in the twelfth century with the Armenian patriarch Nerses IV and sent delegates under the leadership of the philosopher Theorianos (1170 and 1172). ...The Armenians were to abandon their aforementioned heresies, while the Armenian patriarch was to be installed by the Byzantine Emperor.... The terms were adjudged unacceptable....

On his death, Nerses was succeeded by his nephew, Gregory IV. New negotiations were held.... The terms presented by the Byzantines, this time, were restricted to dogmatic matters.... The Armenians rejected the proposed terms. It seems that the terms were rejected because they wanted union only if the Orthodox accepted the confession of Nerses IV, which, however, set aside the Fourth Œcumenical Synod.<sup>4</sup>

Pertinent to this are the observations of Professor John Karmiris:

Neither the union efforts of Saint Photios and Manuel Comnenos, through Theorianos, nor efforts by the pro-Orthodox Armenian *Katholikoi* cited above and by many Orthodox Byzantines were adequate to wean the Armenians away, once and for all, from their 'longstanding error' of Monophysitism, since they were never willing, through a unanimous synodical decision, to recognize officially the Fourth Œcumenical Synod.<sup>5</sup>

Attempts to bring the Jacobites in the direction of Orthodoxy also failed to produce the sought-after union:

Emperor Manuel Comnenos, ...by way of Theorianos, sent a letter to their patriarch; but he, in response, adhered to the doctrine of one nature in Christ. Theorianos went to Kessounion (1170) for dialogues with the envoy of the patriarch and the bishop of that city, but to no avail.<sup>6</sup>

Whenever efforts at union, on account of some matter of political expediency, have been carried out in defiance of the exact teachings [*akriveia*] of the Church (that is, without an explicit confession of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod by the Non-Chalcedonians), the cost for the Church has been a very heavy one. Either new schisms were created in the Body of the Church (e.g., the Akakian Schism), or the occasion arose for deviation into new heresies (e.g., Monothelitism). The *Henoticon* of Emperor Zeno (482) and Heraclios' (633) politics of Church union are typical examples.

Keeping in mind the foregoing historical data, we will essay to evaluate two recent events which took place during the dialogues with the Non-Chalcedonians and which came to our attention by way of relevant publications:

*First:* The adoption, by the Joint Commission, of a "more appealing" methodology, by way of minimizing or passing over dogmatic "peculiarities," in order to achieve more easily a formula for dogmatic agreement.<sup>7</sup>

*Second:* The request of Shenouda III, the patriarch of the Copts, that "there should be no explicit reference [*i.e.*, in the Joint Declaration at Chambésy, 1990] to the Fourth Œcumenical Synod and to Saint Leo, for reasons of pastoral prudence,"<sup>8</sup> and the positive response, thereto, of the Orthodox (despite the disagreements between the Armenians and the Copts over the request in question), so that the dialogues might not run aground.

We are of the humble opinion that the foregoing two points demonstrate that enthusiasm for union brought about the adoption of a methodology and procedural order that have not proved sensitive to dogmatic divergencies.

B. The *Agreements* of 433 expose the Non-Chalcedonians.

At the Third Œcumenical Synod, Saint Cyril and the Fathers of the Synod condemned Nestorios, who divided the Person of Christ into two hypostases: one of God the Word and the other of the man Jesus, and they gave Synodal expression to the confession of the

Church, that the very Hypostasis of God the Word became incarnate and that this Hypostasis constitutes the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ. In this way, they safeguarded the Orthodox teaching concerning the unity of the Person of Christ, which is essential for the salvation of human nature by means of its actual union with the Divinity in the Hypostasis of God the Word.

Although the struggle of Saint Cyril, as an opponent of heresy, was directed against the division of the one Person, nevertheless, an actual distinction between the Natures and an Orthodox understanding of their hypostatic union in one and the same Hypostasis of God the Word, and the actual exchange of attributes of the Natures [*communicatio idiomatum*], by reason of the hypostatic union, are elements that appear clearly in the doctrine of this œcumenical teacher of the Church, when one reads him and interprets him in an Orthodox way.

Thusly, we affirm that He both suffered and rose again, not that God the Word suffered in His Own Nature, ...but since that which became His Own Body suffered these things, again the Same is said to have suffered on our behalf (*Epistle II, to Nestorios*).

With the *Agreements* of 433, Saint Cyril explicitly accepted two Natures after the [hypostatic] union, as is evident from his *Epistle to John of Antioch*.<sup>9</sup>

According to Saint Maximos the Confessor, the Antiochians were correct in accepting two Natures after the union, but erred in not confessing one unique Hypostasis of Christ:

Likewise also in the case of 'One of the Holy Trinity,' Nestorios says that the Natures are different, but does not confess the union, for he does not say that it took place hypostatically (*Patrologia Græca*, Vol. XCI, Col. 145A).<sup>10</sup>

So when, with the *Agreements* of 433, the Antiochians condemned Nestorianism, maintaining as Orthodox the confession of the two distinct and actual Natures after the union—which up to that point they had embraced—, at the same time, they also confessed the unity of the

Person (the Hypostasis of God the Word), admitting the teaching of Saint Cyril and the *Horos* [*Definition*] of the Third Œcumenical Synod. This was the victory of Orthodoxy!

During the Third Œcumenical Synod (431), all the Non-Nestorians (Orthodox, Eutychians, and future moderate Monophysites) had "taken shelter" under the Cyrilline vocabulary. The course of events, however, revealed that not all of the Non-Nestorians were of the same mind, even though they "took shelter" under the same vocabulary of Saint Cyril. The *Agreements* of 433 were the "touchstone."

Saint Cyril and all those who were Orthodox in mind saw that they could accept the Antiochian definition of "two Natures after the union," not as destroying the unity of the Person, but as indicating the actual difference of the Natures. By contrast, the extreme Alexandrians, who had a Monophysite outlook, did not accept the *Agreements*. They thought that Saint Cyril had wavered and deviated. They did not accept the "new" terms, although Cyril himself uttered them: "The formulæ used by the Holy Fathers concerning two Natures united in Christ should be set aside, even if they be Cyril's."<sup>11</sup> In reality, the *Agreements* unmasked the extremists.

Immediately after the *Agreements*, two divergent theological trends begin to take shape, one Orthodox and the other Monophysite.

#### 1. Orthodox:

—Saint Cyril replies to those who questioned the *Agreements*: "We have not gone so mad as to anathematize our own views; but we abide by what we have written and by our way of thinking."<sup>12</sup>

—The Permanent Synod of Constantinople (448), under Patriarch Saint Flavian, reads *Epistle II, to Nestorios* and the *Epistle to the Easterners* as dogmatic texts.<sup>13</sup> It condemns Eutyches as a heretic.

—The Fourth Œcumenical Synod adopts all of the teachings of Saint Cyril and condemns those who selectively accept certain teachings as Orthodox and others as heretical.<sup>14</sup> It vindicates Saint Flavian, that is to say, it recognizes his Orthodoxy, it annuls the Robber Synod of Ephesus (449), anathematizes Eutyches, and deposes Dioscoros.

—The Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Œcumenical Synods successively uphold the Orthodoxy of Saint Cyril and the Fourth Œcumenical Synod.

2. Monophysite:

—Eutyches accepts only the *Twelve Chapters* of Saint Cyril and rejects *Epistle II, to Nestorios* and the *Epistle to the Easterners*. That is to say, he rejects the *Agreements*. For this reason, he is condemned by the Permanent Synod.

—Dioscoros presides over the Robber Synod and vindicates Eutyches,<sup>15</sup> while at the same time he condemns Saint Flavian of Constantinople, as well as all who accepted the *Agreements*.<sup>16</sup> This is why the Holy Fathers of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod said that “Dioscoros trampled on the Faith” and that he was “of the same mind as Eutyches.”<sup>17</sup>

—Timothy Ailouros (457) condemns Saint Cyril on account of the *Agreements*:

Cyril is the Bishop of Alexandria; for this man, having excellently articulated the wise proclamation of Orthodoxy, showed himself to be fickle and is to be censured for teaching contrary doctrine: after previously proposing that we should speak of one nature of God the Word, he destroyed the dogma that he had formulated and is caught professing two Natures of Christ.<sup>18</sup>

Timothy ascends the Patriarchal Throne of Alexandria after his followers first murder the Orthodox Patriarch, the Hieromartyr Saint Proterios, on the Holy Table.

—Peter the Fuller (470) introduces the Theopaschite clause “...crucified for us” into the *Trisagion* Hymn.

—Philoxenos of Hierapolis convenes a synod in Constantinople (499), deposes and exiles Flavian, the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, and elevates Severos in his place.<sup>19</sup>

—Severos of Antioch was a disciple of Timothy Ailouros and held the same views.<sup>20</sup>

—Theodosios of Alexandria consecrates Jacob Baradaïos, from whom the present-day Jacobites of Syria derive.<sup>21</sup>

—Jacob Baradaïos, in coöperation with Peter, the Monophysite bishop of Alexandria (successor of Theodosios), organizes the Monophysites of Egypt, the Copts.<sup>22</sup>

—Syrian Monophysites spread their heresy to Armenia, too.

It is said that the tolerant Saint Cyril accepted the *Agreements* for the sake of ecclesiastical peace. We are of the opinion that the formation of the *Agreements* was theologically indispensable, in order to remove any suspicion that he did not confess two actual Natures after the union.

The assurance of Father John Romanides on this subject is very relevant:

On the contrary, the fact that Saint Cyril accepted the confession of John of Antioch as Orthodox means that Dioscoros and his successors traced out a line which is not absolutely that of Saint Cyril. If this is how things stand, and it does appear so, as is indicated by the historical theology of the Non-Chalcedonians, the studies of Father Samuel, and evidenced by the misgivings of Mr. Karmiris on one point in the address of Patriarch Theophilos of Ethiopia, then we know that this teaching is not exactly that of Saint Cyril, the Third, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Œcumenical Synods.<sup>23</sup>

C. The mind of the Church as it appears from the *Synaxaria*.

It is a fact that the great Fathers and teachers of the Church fought for the purity of Her Orthodox Faith. They combined a personal experience of deification with excellent secular education. They had the prerequisites for interpreting the Faith and for formulating dogmas. Saint Athanasios the Great, Saint Basil the Great, Saint Gregory the Theologian, Saint Cyril, and other Fathers in later ages bore the burden of the struggle against heresies.

However, for the sake of simpler people, God provided that great miracles should occur, by which means the Orthodox might be strengthened in the Faith, while well-intentioned heretics might return in repentance. The miracle of Saint Spyridon at the First Œcumenical Synod is well known, as is the miracle of Saint Irene the Great Martyr at the Fourth Œcumenical Synod.

Similar miraculous events are preserved in the *Synaxaria*. The mere fact that the *Synaxaria* are an integral part of the worship of the Church and that the Orthodox are nourished by them is enough to show the great importance that they have for the topic at hand: To what extent do the Non-Chalcedonians have the same Faith as the [Orthodox] Church?

The Orthodox Christians of the fifth and sixth centuries and the Orthodox Christians of today, as members of the same One, Holy Church of Christ, cannot have a divergent attitude regarding the Orthodoxy of the Non-Chalcedonians. The following examples are very significant.

Saint Savvas the Sanctified, whom God honored with special signs of His Grace, such as the incorruption and fragrance of his Holy Relics even to this day, judged with lucidity that the faith of the Non-Chalcedonians constituted a heresy. In his *Life*, there is mention of his visit to the palace of Justinian, during which the Empress Theodora sought to receive his blessing to have a child. The Saint wished her victories over the barbarians and worldly glory, but despite her repeated entreaties, he did not consent to bless her to have a child, solely because Theodora openly favored the Monophysitism of the Non-Chalcedonians.

In the *Spiritual Meadow* of John Moschos, written precisely in the period that we are concerned with, there are more than ten stories which refer to the relations between Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians and which attest to the unorthodox faith of the latter. We shall briefly present certain of these stories.

Chapter 26: The monk Theophanes, a Nestorian, had difficulty rejecting the heresy of Nestorios, as he was advised to do by Abba Kyriakos. "Everyone says that salvation rests in his own confession," protested Theophanes. But he humbly sought the prayer of Kyriakos to reveal the truth to him. After the prayer of Abba Kyriakos, he received an answer. In a vision, he saw all the heretics in a dark and foul-smelling place: Nestorios, Theodore, Eutyches, Apollinarios, Evagrius, Didymos, Dioscoros, Severos, Arios, Origen, and several others. Following this

vision, he returned to communion in the Mysteries of the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

Chapter 30: The monk Isidore, who passed his whole monastic life in unceasing tears, recounted the cause of his mourning. As a layman he belonged together with his wife to the heresy of Severos. One time, when he was desecrating the Holy Communion of the Orthodox by tossing it out of the window into the mud, he saw a thunderbolt fall and carry away the Divine Communion. This was the cause of his conversion.

Chapter 36: Patriarch Ephraim of Antioch besought a certain Severian stylite with many entreaties and admonitions to return to the Church. The latter asked him for a sign: that the two of them should go into the fire; the truth would be on the side of him who was preserved. With great humility, the Patriarch sought to evade the venture, but finally undertook it for the salvation of the monk. The stylite remained awestruck and refused to enter the fire. The Patriarch then threw his *omophorion* into the flames. After three hours, the *omophorion* was drawn out in one piece. The stylite anathematized Severos and communed with Patriarch Ephraim.

Chapter 46: Abba Kyriakos saw in a vision the Lady *Theotokos* accompanied by Saint John the Theologian and Saint John the Baptist. When he invited them to bless his cell, the Lady *Theotokos* replied sternly: "You have my enemy in your cell, and yet you ask me to go inside?" The reason for this was he had a book in his cell, in the concluding pages of which appeared two discourses of Nestorios. He immediately threw it away.

Chapters 48 and 49: Two official political figures, Cosmiani and Gevemer, were prevented from venerating the Life-Giving Tomb of Christ, the former by the Lady *Theotokos* and the latter by a mysterious ram. Only when, on the advice of the clergy of the All-Holy Tomb, they renounced their heresy—they were followers of Severos—, could they venerate it.



Chapter 79: Portions of the Divine Communion of the Orthodox were found in the house of a wealthy layman who belonged to the heresy of Severos. They had been preserved for a year in the closet of an Orthodox servant. The master of the house wanted to destroy them. However, he was completely surprised to see that ears of grain had germinated on the portions. In repentance, he communicated the miracle to the holy Bishop Dionysios, and the whole population of the city saw the ears of grain. At that time, many people returned to the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

This is the experience of the Church. It is worth asking how it is possible for the same Church, which then lived through these miracles, can now believe that the Non-Chalcedonians "always preserved the same authentic Orthodox Christological Faith and the uninterrupted continuity of the Apostolic Tradition"!

### III. Dogmatic Differences

#### A. Is Severos Orthodox?

In its Third Joint Declaration (1993), the Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue proposed the lifting of anathemas which had been imposed in the past on persons or synods, if it should be recognized that these persons or synods were Orthodox in their teaching.<sup>25</sup> Correspondingly, there are certain publications, older and recent, which present as legitimate the acknowledgment that the Christology of Severos is Orthodox.

We believe that this acknowledgment does not hold water, because Severos was condemned Synodally. In our report, we touch on certain points of his Christology, compare them to the teaching of the Holy Fathers, and arrive at conclusions, from which it is evident that Severos and his teaching were rightly condemned.

As sources for the teaching of Severos, we have used the studies of the Non-Chalcedonian professor V. C. Samuel.<sup>26</sup> One of the enumera-

tions of the dogmatic differences between Severos and Saint John of Damascus made by Samuel will comprise the introductory text. He writes:

1. The Chalcedonian theologian accepts all the Alexandrian expressions included under 'one incarnate nature of God the Word.' In so doing *the Damascene understands the term 'nature' in the sense of 'essence.'* But Severos insists that this sense does not safeguard the historical reality of Jesus Christ, and that if we are to safeguard it, we must confess the hypostatic character of the natures which came into union.

2. John of Damascus does not say clearly what he means by the expression '*composite Person*,' or '*composite Hypostasis*,' although he accepts it. Severos uses the phrase and clarifies its meaning. The one Hypostasis, he says, was formed from the concurrence of the Divinity and the Humanity of Christ. *In the union, the Humanity has been individuated, and for this reason it preserves its hypostatic character*, as well as the potential for the human expression of the Divine energies and attributes, so that it can be grasped by us.

3. Severos *does not believe that in order for the true Humanity in Christ to be preserved there is any need for expressions like 'in two Natures,' 'two wills,' 'two energies,'* and similar expressions. According to his perspective, these expressions introduce division of the one Christ, and consequently cannot guarantee a true Incarnation.

4. ....

5. The insistence of John of Damascus on *the Deification of the Humanity of Christ* is connected with his refusal to accept the hypostatic character of the Humanity of Christ. Severos, on the other hand, is unyielding on this point.<sup>27</sup>

If we have correctly understood Professor Samuel, it seems that Severos attempts to understand the mystery of the Incarnation by using the philosophy of Aristotle as a tool. For this reason, as it appears from the texts of Samuel and from the above extract: *Severos distinguishes between essence and nature, equates nature with hypostasis, understands the hypostatic union differently from the Holy Fathers, distinguishes between hypostasis and person, ascribes will and energy to the person and not*

to the nature, and finally, does not have an Orthodox understanding of how the assumed Humanity of Christ is Deified.

We shall proceed to analyze the points on which Severos is not in accord with the Fathers.

# I. The theology of Severos is Aristotelian.

Severos is not the first to use the terminology of his period with the content that Aristotelian philosophy gives to it. Arios and other heretics did exactly the same thing in their attempts to comprehend the mysterious rationally. The Holy Fathers used the same terminology, but gave it such content that it could express all that they knew from personal experience of God and as a result of being enlightened from on High. Saint John of Damascus writes on this point:

The pagan philosophers, according to the aforementioned discourse, said that essence and nature were different.... The Holy Fathers, passing over their many quarrels, called that which is common and said of many things, that is, the most specific kind, "essence," "nature," and "form", such as Angel, man, horse, dog, and the like.... They called that which is particular, "individual," "person," and "hypostasis," such as Peter and Paul.<sup>28</sup>

And Saint Maximos the Confessor wholly equates the terms "essence" and "nature" (*Patrologia Græca*, Vol. xci, Col. 149B) and the terms "hypostasis" and "person" (*Patrologia Græca*, Vol. xci, Col. 152A).

Up to this day, the Non-Chalcedonians insist that in the domain of *Theology*—that is, the dogma of the Trinity—, the Fathers made a distinction between "Nature" and "Hypostasis," whereas in the domain of *Æconomy*—that is, of Christological dogma—, they equated the terms. This view, however, is not consonant with the opinion of the Holy Fathers. Saint Maximos sees wickedness in the new invention of the Non-Chalcedonians,<sup>29</sup> while Saint John of Damascus asks: Why should one equate these terms in the domain of *Æconomy*?

It has repeatedly been said that terminological ambiguity created the enormous difficulties in mutual understanding between the Orthodox and the Non-Chalcedonians in the centuries that followed the Fourth Ecumenical Synod. This is used today, especially, as a lever for the

reunion of the separated bodies, in the sense that the confession is the same, even if the two sides could not understand each other in the past.

We think that this is not correct. The Saints of the Church, who were of the same mind, formulated Christological dogma in an equally Orthodox way, even if with differing terms.<sup>30</sup> Nor is terminological ambiguity even a decisive factor in determining the absence of Orthodoxy. For example, Saint John Chrysostomos and Theodore of Mopsuestia were contemporaries and fellow ascetics; but the one is a Father of the Church and the other is a great heresiarch. Another relevant example is that of Saints Cyril of Alexandria and Leo of Rome, who formulated Christological dogma in an equally authentic and an equally Orthodox manner, although they were combatting different heresies and were aiming at different goals: the former was aiming to safeguard the unity and uniqueness of the Person of Christ without really dividing the two Natures in Christ, while the latter was aiming to ensure the reality of the two Natures, without destroying the unity and uniqueness of the Person.

Consequently, we think that a decisive factor for Orthodoxy, or the lack thereof, was the deeper conception of the question, which the ever-memorable Father Georges Florovsky discusses.<sup>31</sup>

We have observed that in none of the texts of the Holy Fathers is there any mention of acquiescence to the heretics, inasmuch as they can perhaps claim terminological ambiguity as a mitigating factor in their lack of Orthodoxy.<sup>32</sup> We cite the opinions of two Saints, which are characteristic of the style with which the Holy Fathers confront the issue of terminology. Saint John of Damascus:

Furthermore, Dioscoros and Severos and the multitudinous mobs of both accepted that there was one and the same hypostasis, defining in a similar way that there was one nature, 'not knowing what they say nor understanding what they assert.' The disease or deception in their mind lay in this, that they conceived nature and hypostasis to be the same.<sup>33</sup>

Saint Maximos: "Severos knavishly says that hypostasis is the same as nature."<sup>34</sup>



2. Severos accepts that the Human Nature of Christ subsists as an hypostasis.

As we have already said, Severos uses the terms "essence," "nature," "hypostasis," and "person" with the content given to them by Aristotelian philosophy. Severos does not conceive nature as concrete hypostases, but considers it generally as the essence of hypostases of the same kind; for him it is an abstract concept and does not really exist. When the essence is individuated in hypostases, the nature becomes concrete, takes on an hypostatic character, is made an individual, and is actual. What we have said becomes clear in the extract below:<sup>35</sup>

In the case of man, at the precise moment of concurrence between the essence of the body and the essence of the soul, he comes into existence as a psychosomatic totality and receives personhood. The two essences are not united as essences, but at the precise moment of union they become hypostatic realities. 'The body and the soul,' writes Severos, 'from which man is formed, preserve their hypostases....' This point can be explained as follows. Hypostasis is the concrete subsistence which derives from the individuation of an essence.<sup>36</sup>

Severos transfers this example of man, a composite of body and soul, to Christ. In an analogous way, he writes, the Divine and Human Natures subsist in Christ. For the present, we shall not dwell on the fact, fundamental in other respects, that the example of man cannot be transferred to Christ.<sup>37</sup>

Especially significant in this connection is the fact that according to Severos, the Human Nature of Christ participated in the union—although not before the moment of union—as hypostasis, and, in particular, having the elements which make it a person:<sup>38</sup>

The Divinity and the Humanity, then, combined into one. The moment that the Divinity came to union in God the Son, the Humanity came to union in an individuated state. As Severos writes: 'God the Word is one Hypostasis; He united to Himself hypostatically a particular flesh, which had a rational and spiritual soul, and which He assumed from the Virgin Mary.' *The two Natures, then, which came together in union were hypostases,*

although the Humanity of Christ received Its hypostatic condition only after the union.<sup>39</sup>

The following extract explains a great deal:

In uniting humanity to Himself, does God the Word assume it only as an abstract reality, without it being in an hypostatic or personal condition? If the Humanity of Christ does not have the features which make it a person, can it function in any way in the Incarnation?<sup>40</sup>

In juxtaposing the teaching of the [Orthodox] Church, we confirm its difference from that of Severos. It is taken for granted that nature understood "in mere thought" is something abstract. God the Word, according to Saint John of Damascus, assumed not the nature, understood in this way, nor that which is observed in the species, that is, all men together, but that which is observed in the individual, which is itself observed in the species,<sup>41</sup> but which does not have an hypostatic character, but is observed as a whole in every hypostasis of the same species.<sup>42</sup> The Saint, therefore, writes:

For the flesh of God the Word did not subsist in its own right, nor did another hypostasis come into being besides the Hypostasis of God the Word, but rather, the flesh subsisted in It enhypostatically and did not become a self-existing hypostasis in itself.<sup>43</sup>

And again, in another work of his:

It should be known that it is possible for natures to be united with each other hypostatically, as in the case of man, and for a nature to be assumed by an hypostasis and to subsist in it, both of which are observed in the case of Christ..., but it is absolutely impossible for one composite nature to be formed from two natures or one hypostasis from two hypostases; ...and, again, it is impossible for things that subsist by themselves to have another source of subsistence.<sup>44</sup>

Saint Maximos had clearly detected the possibility of ascribing a Nestorian understanding of the union of the Natures to Severos: "If, again, he says that the union occurred from hypostases or persons, he

is proven to be of like mind with Ebion, Paul of Samosata, and Nestorios...."<sup>45</sup>

It is natural for the Non-Chalcedonians not to accept the accusation of Nestorianism that Saint Maximos—and we, too, as a result—imputes to them, because their reference to an hypostatic character of human nature does not signify Nestorianism in their view, but the safeguarding of the reality of the nature. However, this insistence of theirs is of no avail, because a good intention is not sufficient for an Orthodox formulation of dogma, but only a correct attitude, correct presuppositions, and clear formulation. How can one make a distinction between hypostasis and hypostasis, unless the one is called "hypostasis" and the other "person"? It is precisely on this point, however, that we find the other erroneous philosophical presupposition of the Non-Chalcedonians: the differentiation of hypostasis and person.<sup>46</sup> Hence, their confusion as to the mystery of the hypostatic union.

We consider it indispensable to make an observation that is relevant to the hypostatic character—according to Severos—of human nature. Father John Romanides raised this point at the unofficial meeting in Bristol,<sup>47</sup> and has made Orthodox theologians sensitive to it at the meeting of the Inter-Orthodox Commission in Addis Ababa in 1971.<sup>48</sup> Let us ask ourselves: Does this subject not perhaps fall into the set of the subjects that were not examined in detail, since a more appealing method was chosen at the ensuing official theological dialogue?

### 3. The hypostatic union according to Severos.

The term "hypostatic union" was used by Saint Cyril<sup>49</sup> in the sense of a real union of the two Natures in the one Hypostasis of God the Word. The Antiochians<sup>50</sup> contested this term as being innovative and as not expressing the mystery of the union of the Natures in Christ, and for this reason they missed the mark and found themselves in the domain of heresy.

The hypostatic union, when understood in an Orthodox manner, is the kernel of Christological dogma and the weapon against all Christological heresy. In the writings of the Holy Fathers, there is a plethora

of references to this fundamental principle of Christology. In the mystery of the union of the Natures, the Hypostasis of God the Word has ontological priority. This Word was made incarnate by assuming flesh with a rational and spiritual soul and uniting it with His Divinity, in such a way that this eternal Hypostasis of His became also the Hypostasis of the assumed flesh. The enhypostatic character of the assumed flesh constitutes the most perfect dogmatic formulation of the mystery of union. The "function" of God the Word is not exhausted in the mere fact that It was united with the flesh, but in the fact that the Word Himself now eternally constitutes the Hypostasis and Person of Christ, the Word Incarnate.

In this sense, the union of the two Natures of Christ, as a kind of accomplishment, is not preceded ontologically by the "formation" of the Person of Christ, Emmanuel, the Word Incarnate. In very simple words, the Non-Chalcedonians focus their capacity for understanding on the fact that the Nature of the Word and human nature were united, and not on the fact that God the Word united these natures in Himself. Consequently, they understand the Person as a fruit of the union, whereas in the second case they would understand that the Person (that is, God the Word) effects the union.

This divergent understanding of the Non-Chalcedonians is clearly evident to anyone who carefully studies many of their own texts, such as the phrase below: "*The union brought a single Person into existence*, and this one Person is the Person of God the Son in His incarnate state."<sup>51</sup>

Continuing, the foregoing text asserts: "There is a distinction between the Son before the Incarnation and the Incarnate Son, such that the Hypostasis and Person of Jesus Christ are not simply the Person of God the Son."<sup>52</sup>

This position is not correct. This is because, although the Son before the Incarnation did not have the Human Nature which He assumed through His Incarnation, with the addition of the second limb to the above formulation, that is, of the clause "...such that...of God

the Son," the impression is given that the Hypostasis of God the Word underwent some inherent change.

A second point about the subject of the hypostatic union that the Non-Chalcedonians do not understand correctly is that which refers to the individuation of the Human Nature at the same time as its union with God the Word. Samuel emphasizes this fact *ad nauseam*, and he also states it unequivocally in the extract below:

The phrase 'hypostatic union,' therefore, means, according to Severos, that there was a concurrence in Christ of whatever the Divine Nature of the Son provides and whatever an individuated human nature contributes. The phrase also signifies the absolutely intrinsic and personal character of the union.<sup>53</sup>

One can now easily guess the significance of the above for the definition of the "composite Hypostasis" of Christ. It is already time for us to affirm that Saint John of Damascus is unjustly accused of not saying clearly what he means by "composite Hypostasis," obviously on account of the different viewpoint from which, as we have said, the Non-Chalcedonians see the hypostatic union. In any case, the Saint *is* clear, as will be evident from the extract below, and this formulation constitutes a barometer of Orthodoxy and, at the same time, a refutation of Non-Chalcedonian ideas. He writes as follows:

We affirm that the Divine Hypostasis of God the Word pre-existed timelessly and eternally, simple and incomposite, uncreated, incorporeal, invisible, impalpable, uncircumscribable, ...and in the last days, without departing from the bosom of the Father, the Word uncircumscribably dwelt in the womb of the Holy Virgin seedlessly and incomprehensibly, as He Himself saw fit, and subjected the flesh from the Holy Virgin to Himself in this preëternal Hypostasis of His.... He became flesh from her, therefore, assuming the firstfruits of our compound make-up, flesh animated by a rational and spiritual soul, so that the Hypostasis of God the Word became an Hypostasis for the flesh, and that what had previously been the simple Hypostasis of the Word became composite—a composite of two perfect Natures, Divinity and Humanity.<sup>54</sup>

The Non-Chalcedonians, as if they are unaware of the foregoing, define as a composite Hypostasis the result of the concurrence of the Divinity and individuated Humanity: "Severos uses the phrase and clarifies its meaning. The one Hypostasis, he says, was formed from the concurrence of the Divinity and the Humanity."<sup>55</sup>

*It is characteristic, we think, that Severos does not define the Hypostasis of God the Word as the Hypostasis of the assumed flesh as well.* For precisely this reason, Professor Samuel poses the question in puzzlement: How is it possible for the enhypostatic Human Nature to safeguard in itself a truly functional position for the Person of Christ, since it does not have an hypostatic and personal character?<sup>56</sup> This is a fundamental divergence from Orthodox teaching! Only the clear and unambiguous confession of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod can cure this erroneous view of the Non-Chalcedonians. That is: We confess "one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-Begotten, [God the Word] known...in two Natures."

The following paragraphs will make clear how central a rôle the aforementioned position of Severos plays in understanding Christological dogma and in its ramifications for the theology of the Church.

#### 4. Severos teaches Monoenergism.

Monotheletism and Monoenergism emerged as theological currents a hundred years after the death of Severos. However, his Monoenergetic frame of mind is unmistakable in his teaching. A vehement enemy of the Holy Fourth Œcumenical Synod, he did not accept that "Each Nature acts in common with the other...."

As is well known, the teaching of the Church on this point is that the will and the energy are essential properties of the nature: "But He truly became Man, not without a *natural energy, whose logos is a definition of the essence*, which characterizes naturally all those in whom it is innate according to the essence."<sup>57</sup> Simply willing and acting belong to the nature, whereas how one wills belongs to the hypostasis.<sup>58</sup> It is likewise well known that the Sixth Œcumenical Synod consolidated this

teaching by its authority: "Each Nature in common with the other both wills and acts in its own way."

Severos, by contrast, ascribes the energy to the person with characteristic clarity. He writes:

When we anathematize those who affirm two Natures of Emmanuel after the union, along with their energies and properties, we do not place them under condemnation because they speak about natures, energies, or properties, but because they say that there are two Natures after the union and ascribe the energies and properties to each of these, hereby dividing them up between the Natures.<sup>59</sup>

The erroneous and inadequate understanding of the hypostatic union shows its first basic consequence: the equally erroneous understanding of the exchange of properties of the Natures. According to the Non-Chalcedonians, the union of the Natures in the one nature of the Incarnate Word permits the exchange of properties in such a way that the Incarnate Word has a composite Theandric energy. The following words of Severos suggest this:<sup>60</sup>

To which Nature are we to ascribe the activity [energy] of walking on water? Let them reply who introduce for us the two Natures after the union. To the Divine Nature? And how is going with bodily feet a property of Divinity? Well, to the Human Nature? And how is walking on liquid not alien to humanity? ...But it is obvious and not at all ambiguous, unless we are willfully drunk, that, since God the Word, Who became Incarnate for us, is one and indivisible, His energy is also indivisible.<sup>61</sup>

However, the Holy Fathers see in this example and in others like it two energies and one Christ acting either Divinely or Humanly:

Since, therefore, there are two Natures of Christ, we affirm that His natural wills and His natural energies are two. Since there is one Hypostasis of His Natures, we affirm that One and the Same both wills and acts naturally in both the Natures.<sup>62</sup>

The subject of the energies of Christ was always one of the most important points of friction. The confession of acting Natures in Christ

signified two persons for the Non-Chalcedonians, and for this reason they did not, in any way, accept two energies. They said:

Since He is the Only-Begotten Son of the Father and is also the Only-Begotten Son of His Mother, He is one Son. As one Son, He is one Christ; as one Christ, He is one Hypostasis; as one Hypostasis, He is one Person; as one Person, He is one will; as one will, He is also one energy; as one energy, He is one nature. In truth, He is one nature.<sup>63</sup>

Until recently, the attitude of the Non-Chalcedonians towards Dyothelete views was very harsh:

We cannot accept the Dyothelete formulation [*i.e.*, of the Sixth Ecumenical Synod], which ascribes will and energy to the Natures rather than the Hypostasis. We are able to confess only the united and unconfused Theandric nature, will, and energy of Christ, the Incarnate Lord.<sup>64</sup>

The Orthodox understanding of the exchange of attributes comes from an Orthodox understanding of hypostatic union. Since the Divine properties as much as the Human are attributed to one and the same Hypostasis of God the Word, the Word suffers on the Cross in the flesh, and the flesh of the Word is said to be, and is, life-giving. Saint John of Damascus analyzes this subject with wonderful clarity in his chapter, "Concerning the Manner of the Exchange" (*Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, Book III, Chapter 4 [48]). In this sense of the exchange of attributes, understood in an Orthodox way, the Theandric energy is also interpreted in an Orthodox way:

Thus, in Christ, Divine and Almighty energy belongs to His Divinity, while ours [*i.e.*, human energy] belongs to His Humanity. Holding the hand of the newly created and drawing him up is a result of Human Nature, while the giving of life is a result of the Divine. For the former is one thing, and the latter is another, although they are inseparable in the Theandric energy.<sup>65</sup>

One can find a more detailed reference to the subject of Theandric energy in Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, Book III, Chapter 19 [63].



5. Severos accepts the heretical teaching of individual essences.

The Aristotelian concept of primary essences is condemned by the Holy Fathers, because with regard to Trinitarian dogma, it introduces tritheism, while in the case of Christological dogma, it leads to the acknowledgment of one nature in Christ. Arios and John Philoponos are classic representatives of this theory.<sup>66</sup>

Saint Anastasios of Sinai attributes this heretical teaching to Severos. He writes:

Aristotle says that persons are particular essences. Going by this vain rule, Arios said that there were three essences, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Going by this iniquitous definition, Severos said that Christ was one nature formed from two particular essences, that is, separate hypostases.<sup>67</sup>

Saint John of Damascus also accuses the Non-Chalcedonians of Egypt, the Schematics and Monophysites, of accepting this theory of particular essences: "Nevertheless, in teaching that there are particular essences, they confound the mystery of the Incarnation."<sup>68</sup>

On the basis of these testimonies from the Holy Fathers, we understand that Severos "teaches that there are particular essences," at least as he is interpreted by Professor Samuel. The multiple references to the individuated essence being an hypostasis and an individual with personal existence attest to the truth of this statement.

On this point, the teaching of the [Orthodox] Church is completely different. According to Saint John of Damascus, the entire Divinity in the Hypostasis of the Word is united with the whole<sup>69</sup> of human nature (*Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, Book III, Chapter 6 [50]), which, however, took on existence only in the Hypostasis of the Word (*ibid.*, Chapter II [55]), without being either an hypostasis in its own right (*ibid.*, Chapter 9 [53]) or an individual (*ibid.*, Chapter II [55]).

6. How does Severos conceive the deification of man?

The Orthodox teaching on deification is based on the hypostatic union of the two Natures in the same Hypostasis of God the Word. The result of this hypostatic union is the Deification of the assumed

Human Nature: "For the Word became flesh and the flesh became Word, although neither departed from its own Nature."<sup>70</sup>

Saint Gregory Palamas teaches explicitly that renewal in Christ is not a renewal of human hypostases, but of the human nature that is answerable to Him, with which nature the Word of God was united according to His Own Hypostasis: "It was not our hypostasis that He assumed from us and made new, but our nature, united with it according to His Own Hypostasis" (*Homily V, Patrologia Græca*, Vol. CLI, Col. 64BC). ... The flesh of Christ, as the Body of the Incarnate Word of God, is for Saint Gregory Palamas and the Orthodox Tradition the point of contact between man with God. The flesh of Christ, as the Body of the Divine Word, was the first to be saved and freed. We, therefore, he adds, "... as fellow members of the Body, are saved in It" (Saint Athanasios the Great, *Against the Arians, Patrologia Græca*, Vol. xxvi, Col. 277B). ... Through the Deification of the Human Nature of Christ "the firstfruits of our compound make-up" were deified and a "new root" was created, sufficient to impart life and incorruption to its offshoots (*On Behalf of the Holy Hesychasts*, III.1.33). ... The union (of men) with the new root is accomplished through free personal participation in the renewal in Christ.<sup>71</sup>

From the foregoing, one understands the most tragic consequence of the unorthodox confession of the Non-Chalcedonians concerning the hypostatic union. If human nature is not enhypostatic in the Hypostasis of God the Word, how is it deified? Or, if it is deified through its own union with the Divinity, how is it not changed or not commingled? Where can we find a composite nature that preserves the essential differences of the things of which it is composed? Only a composite Hypostasis has this capacity.

The Non-Chalcedonians do not seem to grasp what is meant by the deification of our compound make-up. The salvation of men is thought of as an external event, as the extract below makes clear: "In assuming a member of the human race[!], God the Son accomplished the salvation of the whole of humanity by means of this member of the human family[!]."<sup>72</sup>

In connection with this, Samuel writes again that every man is saved when he responds to the love of God. However, he does not clarify how salvation (that is, deification) is communicated to the different human hypostases. The heretical teaching concerning particular essences, that is, that human nature was assumed by God the Word as an individual, is the principal cause of the problem.

We think that this subject is very serious and should not be one of those that they can avoid discussing in a theological dialogue.

#### B. The Theopaschite addition to the *Trisagion*.

From the period that the Monophysite patriarch of Antioch Peter the Fuller (470) introduced the Theopaschite clause "...crucified for us" into the *Trisagion*, the Non-Chalcedonians have preserved it until today in their worship, and in order to strengthen it dogmatically, they ascribe the Hymn only to the Son.

The Holy Fathers, however, always ascribed the *Trisagion* Hymn to the Holy Trinity, as also the thrice-holy doxology which the Prophet Isaiah recounts. There is an extended discussion of this subject by Saint John of Damascus in *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, Book III, Chapter 10 [54] and in *On the Trisagion Hymn* (in *Greek Fathers of the Church*, Vol. 4 [1990], p. 204).

It is characteristic of the Non-Chalcedonians that they observe that "in this [prayer] the union of the Divine and Human in the Incarnate God is made very clear,"<sup>73</sup> because it brings out what we customarily call *Theopaschitism*. According to them, in the one nature of Christ, it is not only the flesh that undergoes sufferings, but also the Divinity united with the flesh:

The Divinity is never separated from the flesh and the flesh is never separated from the Divinity. Where the Divinity is found, the flesh will be found also. Because of the perfect union, both were even subject to death[!].<sup>74</sup>

To begin with, it seems like an oxymoron for them to think that before the union with the flesh the Divinity was impassible, while after the union it is passible: "The Divinity, which is impassible, suffered on

the Cross by reason of His union with the flesh."<sup>75</sup> However, this is completely understandable, if we take into account the fact that the Non-Chalcedonians do not have a correct grasp of the hypostatic union, according to which God the Word can be said to be and be impassible and passible: on the one hand, in His Divinity, and on the other, in His Humanity. Rather, they understand the union of the Natures in themselves as the formation of one composite nature, in which the properties of the flesh are communicated to the Divinity and those of the Divinity to the flesh:

'The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.' In the same way, we can say that the flesh also became Divine. Thus, the properties of the flesh can be ascribed to God the Word [in the Divine Nature] and *vice versa*.<sup>76</sup>

This is unacceptable from an Orthodox point of view. Saint John of Damascus says:

In speaking of the Divinity [of Christ], we do not predicate of It the attributes of the Humanity [of Christ]; for we do not say that the Divinity is passible or created. Nor do we predicate of the flesh, that is, of the Humanity, the properties of the Divinity; for we do not say that the flesh or the Humanity is uncreated.<sup>77</sup>

We are not unaware that the Non-Chalcedonians proclaim that Christ is co-essential with the Father and therefore impassible in His Divinity, and that God the Word is both impassible and passible. However, their doctrine of the composite nature of Christ allows them to give expression to Theopaschite interpretations like the one above.<sup>78</sup> Only the unambiguous confession of the Orthodox formulation of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod, and this alone, can free the Non-Chalcedonians from this confusion.

C. Saint Maximos the Confessor reveals the Monophysite meaning of the phrase "in thought alone."

The phrase "in thought alone" admits of a twofold interpretation: either Orthodox or Monophysite. Its Orthodox meaning is determined by the Holy Fifth Œcumenical Synod in Paragraph VII of its *Resolution*,



which anathematizes anyone who uses the number "two" in order to insinuate that the Natures of Christ are separated and self-subsisting, whereas the difference—that is, the separation by parts<sup>79</sup>—should be taken only "in thought."

It is well known that the Fifth Œcumenical Synod had to resolve the very serious issue of the misinterpretation of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod by the then Nestorianizing West. It was not the confession of the number of the Natures of Christ in itself that caused the problem,<sup>80</sup> but the possibility of its misinterpretation, that is, that the Natures should be thought to be separated and self-subsisting. Consequently, it is essential that emphasis be given to the phrase "...but uses the number with this intention, that the Natures be separated and self-subsisting," because this gives meaning and content to the clause "in thought alone." If we wish mentally to posit the Natures of Christ in separation, by parts, we are already Nestorians, because we shall of necessity lend them a particular hypostasis, something which signifies a division of the Person of Christ into two hypostases.

We Orthodox, however, who confess the unity and uniqueness of the Person of Christ, as the eternal Hypostasis of God the Word, are never able to divide the Natures and posit them separately and side by side. Consequently, when we confess two Natures in the one Hypostasis of the Word, we have in mind, for certain, the essential difference of the Natures in reality and not in thought alone. How else can the difference between the uncreated Divinity and the created flesh be removed?

If, on the contrary, according to the Non-Chalcedonians the Natures after the union are distinguished in thought alone, it is reasonable to pose the question: Are the Natures confused in reality? Saint Maximos refutes precisely this misinterpretation by the Non-Chalcedonians of the clause "in thought alone" and considers it to be a cover for the confusion of the Natures: "In professing the difference after the union to be a mere difference, Severos thinks that the existence of the differing Natures is conceptual, while in actuality he posits their confusion."<sup>81</sup>

Since Nestorios also, with the same reasoning, "called the union a mere appellation alone, but in actuality introduced the division of things,"<sup>82</sup> Saint Maximos concludes his critique as follows: "Truly they are an evil pair of lawless men, who are filled with an evil rage to tear apart the Truth of correct dogmas through opposite points of view."<sup>83</sup>

#### D. Iconoclasm and its Monophysite presuppositions.

Iconoclasm is not directly related to the Non-Chalcedonians. The Iconoclast Emperors and Bishops were typically Orthodox. But their theological presuppositions were Monophysite. This conclusion is drawn from an analysis of the arguments of the Iconoclasts, which are as follows:<sup>84</sup>

1. They maintained that the depiction of Christ is inadmissible, because by being depicted His uncircumscribable and shapeless Divinity is circumscribed and given shape.
2. They did not accept that Christ is the Prototype of His image, because they believed that would mean that Christ is a mere man.
3. They asserted that the depiction of Christ introduces, apart from the Hypostasis of the Word, a second, circumscribed person, which leads to the acceptance of two persons, that is, to Nestorianism.

From these arguments the Christological presuppositions of the Iconoclasts are clear. They entail respectively, the following:

- a) A confusion between nature and hypostasis, which in consequence leads to their identification.
- b) A heretical view of the way in which the two Natures are united in Christ. And,
- c) a failure to confess—chiefly as an attitude and not as a simple oral confession—that the Hypostasis of God the Word is also the Hypostasis of the assumed flesh.

These, now, are the Christological views of the Non-Chalcedonians, as we have already said, in referring to the Christology of Severos.

The Christological presuppositions of the Iconophile Holy Fathers and Confessors Theodore the Studite, Patriarch Nikephoros of Constantinople, and John of Damascus are completely contrary, as also are

those of the Holy Fathers who comprised the Holy Seventh Œcumenical Synod. All of them, having the Christology of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod as a basis and foundation, refuted the arguments of the Iconoclasts as follows:

i) Insofar as, according to Saint Theodore the Studite, "when anything is portrayed in an Icon, it is not the nature, but the hypostasis that is portrayed,"<sup>85</sup> Christ is portrayed as Hypostasis, and this only according to His Human Nature, because the hypostatic union does not confuse His Natures, but preserves the properties of each. Consequently, the uncircumscribable and shapeless Divine Nature is not circumscribed or given shape.

ii) Insofar, again, as the two Natures actually exist after the union and not only "in thought alone,"—as Severos mistakenly supposed—, and insofar as every nature preserves its character (*Horos* of the Fourth Œcumenical Synod), the circumscription of the Human Nature allows Christ to be portrayed in Icons. According to Saint Theodore, "that which is circumscribed is set forth as a product of the Icon that has painted."<sup>86</sup> That is to say, without being stripped of His Divinity, Christ is able to constitute the Prototype of His image according to His Human Nature.

iii) Since the Holy Fathers clearly confess the Hypostasis of God the Word as the Hypostasis of the assumed flesh also, it is in no way possible to introduce a second person. However, this could occur in the Severian view of a composite Hypostasis of Christ.

We have not analyzed the subject of Iconoclasm at random. In the Second Joint Declaration (1990), Paragraph VIII, it is said that the Non-Chalcedonians venerate the Holy Icons according to ancient Tradition. If this actually occurs,<sup>87</sup> the Non-Chalcedonians would have to reconsider the dogmatic basis of the depiction of Christ in Icons and the veneration of Sacred Icons. Otherwise, a chasm-like distance between faith and practice will appear, which would make manifest their dogmatic deviation from the theology that their practice presupposes.

### Thoughts on the Joint Declarations of 1989 and 1990

The Joint Declarations cannot be accepted as formulæ of agreement [*formula concordia*]. Firstly, because they presuppose a common Faith, whereas the dogmatic differences that separate us are still important. Secondly, because in all the paragraphs there are ambiguities which render the text susceptible of twofold interpretation, so that each side can read its own faith into it. For example, in the Second Declaration (1990):

Paragraph III could be a development of "from two Natures," but not of "in two Natures."

In Paragraph IV, there is a confession of hypostatic union, but there is no clarification of its characteristics, that is, that the Hypostasis of God the Word is also the Hypostasis of the assumed flesh, and that the exchange of the attributes of the Natures takes place in the Hypostasis of God the Word and not between the Natures.

In Paragraphs III and IV, there is a confession of the two natural wills and energies, but Monoenergism is not condemned.

In Paragraph V, we see a confession of the fact that the One Who wills and acts is always the one Hypostasis of the Incarnate Word, but no confession of the fact that "each Nature in common with the other both wills and acts in its own way," or, as is also correct, that Christ acts in each of His Natures.

Through Paragraph VI, the interpretations of the Synods that do not agree with the *Horos* of the Third and the *Agreements* are rejected, but the Synods are not specified. On the basis of this paragraph, which Synods would the Non-Chalcedonians reject and which the Orthodox?

With Paragraph VII, the Non-Chalcedonians, presupposing double co-essentiality, use the Cyrilline expression "one Incarnate nature of God the Word"—in which "one nature" unquestionably means "one hypostasis"—, but at the same time (in the First Declaration) they also preserve the clause "one united Theanthropic nature in Christ." The ancient Non-Chalcedonians would be envious of such a formulation. More importantly, today's Non-Chalcedonians would be able to boast that they

remain firm in the faith of their fathers. By contrast, for the Orthodox, a definition was set forth by which the Natures are distinguished in thought alone, something which would satisfy Severos completely, but none of the Holy Fathers (see footnote 79 of the present work).

In Paragraph VIII, the Non-Chalcedonians accept as a matter of interpretation the Orthodoxy of the teachings of Synods subsequent to the Third. Will they ever accept this as their own interpretation?

With such ambiguous formulations, the Non-Chalcedonians can very easily recognize their own faith in these Declarations, and we Orthodox our own. But how can we have a common Cup without a common mind?

### Conclusions

At the very least, it would be naïve for anyone to believe that the enormous subject of Christology could be exhausted in such a brief report. But it is not impossible to summarize the central points, which one absolutely must confess if his Faith is to be Orthodox. From an historical perspective, it should be said that the Holy Fathers knew well with whom they were conversing, and there is no possibility that they misconstrued and condemned the Non-Chalcedonians on account of a misinterpretation. It is neither theological terminology nor racial and cultural factors that played a decisive rôle in the separation of the Non-Chalcedonians from the communion of the Catholic [*i.e.*, Orthodox] Church, but chiefly their erroneous conception, and consequently their formulation, of the manner of the union of the two Natures in Christ.

The dogmatic differences between the two sides are so great that, if they were forgotten, salvation itself would be put at risk. If, that is, the eternal Hypostasis of God the Word is not also the Hypostasis of the assumed flesh, the deification of the compound make-up of man is not possible, in which case the salvation of men through partaking of the Deified and life-giving flesh of the Lord is also impossible.

A great ecclesiological chasm exists between us and the Non-Chalcedonians, which only the explicit confession of the holiness and œcumenicity of the Fourth and the following three Holy Œcumenical Synods on the part of the Non-Chalcedonians can bridge. Any manifest or hidden deviation whatsoever from Orthodox dogma, for the sake of some union contrary to the truth, will occasion only harm to immortal souls and suffering for the Church.

It is our wish and prayer that the Non-Chalcedonians, who are dear to us in all other ways, be made aware that their union with the Church entails that they take up their cross, rejecting and forgetting the house of their fathers, as it is said in the Psalm (44:9-10); then will the King desire the beauty of their union.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> *Episkepsis*, No. 446 (October 1, 1990).

<sup>2</sup> "Declaration of the Sacred Community of the Holy Mountain of Athos on the Dialogues Between the Orthodox and Non-Chalcedonians" (February 1, 1994).

<sup>3</sup> Vlasios Pheidias, "Orthodoxy and the Pre-Chalcedonian Churches," *Episkepsis*, No. 479 (May 31, 1992).

<sup>4</sup> Archimandrite Basil Stephanides, *Church History* (Athens: 1978), pp. 413-414.

<sup>5</sup> "The Ancient Non-Chalcedonian Churches of the East and the Basis for Their Re-union with the Orthodox Catholic Church," *Theologia*, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 577.

<sup>6</sup> Archimandrite Basil Stephanides, *op. cit.*, p. 416.

<sup>7</sup> "Thereafter, the assembly was convened to proceed with an evaluation of the texts, which, in accordance with previous decisions, had been specially hammered out for the present phase of the dialogue. These texts were dogmatic treatises. [Though] ...of extreme importance in and of themselves, it did not prove feasible to consider these texts in depth. The prevailing view was that a different, more appealing *modus operandi* should be put into effect....

"Worthy of note was the stand taken by His Eminence, Bishop Bishoi, who repeatedly came into conflict with the Armenians, reminding them that the goal of the consultation was to search for a way of union, and not to re-affirm separation, in regard to which he emphasized that a way should be found to overcome it.

"As an overall judgment, it can be said that the consultation was essential, since it had the courage to set aside a methodology which would have fruitlessly opened up old wounds, without healing them" (Metropolitan Meletios of Nikopolis, "Report to the

Holy Synod of the Church of Greece Concerning the First Consultation of the Commission for Dialogue Between the Orthodox Church and the Non-Chalcedonian [Oriental Orthodox] Churches," published by the Chief Secretariat of the Holy Synod in an Epistle to the Dioceses of the Church of Greece, Protocol No. 520 [March 10, 1986]).

<sup>8</sup> *Idem*, "Report to the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece Concerning the Assembly in Geneva of the Joint Commission for Dialogue Between the Orthodox Church and the Oriental Orthodox Churches," Archives of the Diocese of Nikopolis and Preveza, Document Protocol No. 416 (October 1, 1990).

<sup>9</sup> "With regard to the Evangelical and Apostolic expressions concerning the Lord, we know that men who are skilled in theology make some of them common to the one Person, while they divide others between the two Natures, ascribing those that are fitting to God to the Divinity of Christ, and those that are lowly to His Humanity. On reading these sacred utterances of Yours, and finding that we ourselves think along the same lines—for there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism—we glorified God the Savior of all" (John Karmiris, *Dogmatic and Creedal Statements of the Orthodox Church*, Vol. 1 [Athens: 1960], p. 154).

<sup>10</sup> Since they did not distinguish between nature and hypostasis, the two Natures signified for them two hypostases. For this reason they divided the Person of Christ.

<sup>11</sup> *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. LXXXIX, Col. 103D. Saint Anastasios of Sinai preserves this phrase of Severos in his works.

<sup>12</sup> *Epistle xxxvii, to Theognostos*, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. LXXVII, Col. 169C, in Metropolitan Meletios of Nikopolis, *The Fifth Ecumenical Synod* (Athens: 1985), p. 54.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64. This in no way signifies that it rejected *Epistle iii, to Nestorios* and the *Twelve Chapters*. Proof of this is the confirmation by the Fourth Ecumenical Synod of the Orthodoxy of the *Twelve Chapters*, as well as of the Permanent Synod.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 91–92.

<sup>15</sup> The Non-Chalcedonians insist that the reasons for which the Permanent Synod condemned Eutyches were not the same as the reasons for which the Robber Synod (449) vindicated him. However, the exoneration of a heretic (Eutyches) to make amends for what according to them was the uncanonical way he was condemned and the condemnation of Saint Flavian for heresy do not give leeway for the acceptance of the opinion of the Non-Chalcedonians. Above all, they confirm that Dioscoros and Eutyches were of the same opinion.

<sup>16</sup> Father Georges Florovsky, *The Byzantine Fathers of the Fifth Century* (Thessaloniki: 1992), p. 470.

<sup>17</sup> Metropolitan Meletios of Nikopolis, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>18</sup> *Epistle to Kalonymos*, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. LXXXVI, Col. 276.

<sup>19</sup> Metropolitan Meletios of Nikopolis, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 84.

<sup>21</sup> Archimandrite Basil Stephanides, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>23</sup> Cited by Metropolitan Methodios of Axum, "The Orthodox–Oriental Dialogue," *Abba Salama*, Vol. 7 (1976), pp. 188–189.

<sup>24</sup> *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. LXXXVII, Cols. 2872–2937.

<sup>25</sup> *Episkepsis*, No. 498 (November 30, 1993).

<sup>26</sup> In the present work we are using the studies of the Non-Chalcedonian Professor Samuel because, 1) they were some of the few Non-Chalcedonian sources that we had at our disposal, 2) he gives an adequate analysis of Severos and affords the easiest approach to him, and 3) as a Non-Chalcedonian theologian of distinction, he is an authentic source of information on the Christology of Severos.

<sup>27</sup> V. C. Samuel, "The Christology of Severus of Antioch," *Abba Salama*, Vol. 4 (1973), p. 181.

<sup>28</sup> *Philosophical Chapters*, Vol. 2 of *Greek Fathers of the Church* (Thessaloniki: 1991), pp. 112–114.

<sup>29</sup> "Severos knavishly says that hypostasis is the same as nature" (*Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. xci, Col. 40A).

<sup>30</sup> For example, Saint Epiphanius of Cyprus wrote: "He Who in truth endured the Passion on our behalf in the flesh and in a perfect Incarnation truly suffered on the Cross; His Divinity was with Him, but was not changed to suffering, since It is impassible and unchangeable. ...[T]he two consequences are clearly grasped, that Christ suffered on our behalf in the flesh, while remaining impassible in His Divinity. The Humanity and the Divinity did not exist on their own, but the Divinity co-existed, only not suffering on account of the purity and incomparability of the Essence" (*Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. XLII, Col. 813C).

<sup>31</sup> Father Georges Florovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 531–532.

<sup>32</sup> In the writings of contemporary theologians, we encounter a spirit of acquiescence, but we think that it is incorrect.

<sup>33</sup> Saint John of Damascus, Vol. 4 of *Greek Fathers of the Church* (Thessaloniki: 1990), p. 346.

<sup>34</sup> *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. xci, Col. 40A.

<sup>35</sup> V. C. Samuel, "The Christology of Severus of Antioch," *op. cit.*, p. 136.

<sup>36</sup> According to Orthodox dogmatic teaching, in hypostases of the same kind the entire nature which is predicated of the kind is conceived. The hypostasis is that which supplies to the commonness of the nature the particular hypostatic features, whereby it is differentiated from the remaining hypostases. One can easily understand that according to Samuel's view the individuation of the essence is that which generates the hypostasis. But let us remember that in Orthodox teaching the emphasis is on the ontological priority of hypostasis over nature: "When God spoke to Moses, He did



not say, 'I am the essence,' but 'I am He Who is'; that which is does not come from the essence, but the essence from that which is; for He Who is encompasses the whole of being in Himself.' The Person of God, according to the passage of Saint Gregory Palamas cited above, is not a product of the Godhead, the Divine Nature, but is precisely He Who is *qua* Divine Person, Which 'enhypostasizes,' that is, makes hypostatic His Divine Nature and gives It Its 'manner of subsisting'" (Bishop Atanasije [Jev-tich], *Joyous Light* [Akritas Publications], pp. 134-135).

<sup>37</sup> The example of man can be used only in the sense that just as a single man is constituted out of soul and body, and not two, so also there is a single Christ, constituted out of Divinity and Humanity, and not two. None of the other features that characterize the union of body and soul can be transferred to Christ. See Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, Book III, Chapter 3 [47], Vol. 1 of *Greek Fathers of the Church* (1976), pp. 288-292.

<sup>38</sup> V. C. Samuel, "The Christology of Severus of Antioch," *op. cit.*, p. 136.

<sup>39</sup> In truth, Professor Samuel becomes more audacious than Severus in his attempt to interpret him.

<sup>40</sup> V. C. Samuel, "Severus of Antioch," *Ekklesiastikos Pharos*, Vol. 58 (1976), p. 290.

<sup>41</sup> Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, *op. cit.*, Book III, Chapter II [55].

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter 6 [50]: "We affirm that the whole and perfect Nature of the Godhead was united in one of His Hypostases to the whole of human nature and a part to a part."

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, Chapter 9 [53].

<sup>44</sup> *Philosophical Chapters*, *op. cit.*, pp. 208-210.

<sup>45</sup> *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. xci, Col. 41A.

<sup>46</sup> The subject of the differentiation of hypostasis and person is broached by Samuel in "The Christology of Severus of Antioch," *op. cit.*, pp. 136-137. But he applies it to Christ in "One Incarnate Nature of God the Word," in *Does Chalcedon Divide or Unite?* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1981), pp. 91-92, where to the observation of Father Romanides that the phrase "The union brought a single Person into existence..." is reminiscent of Nestorianism, he replied: "The clause is based on the emphasis of Severus that there is a distinction between the Son before the Incarnation and the Incarnate Son. By the stress of this expression Severus shows that the Hypostasis of Jesus Christ, although It is contained by the Hypostasis of God the Son, is not simply the latter. The Hypostasis of Jesus Christ is a composite Hypostasis, which was formed by the concurrence of the Divinity and the Humanity."

<sup>47</sup> V. C. Samuel, "The Manhood of Jesus Christ," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (1968), p. 166.

<sup>48</sup> Metropolitan Methodios of Axum, *op. cit.*, pp. 187-188.

<sup>49</sup> "If anyone does not confess that the Word from God the Father was not united hypostatically in the flesh..." (*Second Anathema of Saint Cyril*).

<sup>50</sup> "We confess one Christ, and we call the Same both God and Man on account of the union, but we are completely unaware of the union according to Hypostasis, as foreign and alien to the Divine Scriptures" (*Reply of Theodoret of Cyrrhus to the Second Anathema*).

<sup>51</sup> V. C. Samuel, "One Incarnate Nature of God the Word," *op. cit.*, p. 87.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>54</sup> Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-312.

<sup>55</sup> V. C. Samuel, "The Christology of Severus of Antioch," *op. cit.*, p. 181.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 290.

<sup>57</sup> Saint Maximos the Confessor, *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. xci, Col. 1037C.

<sup>58</sup> Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, *op. cit.*, p. 343.

<sup>59</sup> Cited by Kachali Alemou in *The Christology of the Ethiopian Anaphorai in Relation to the Dogma of Chalcedon* (Thessaloniki: 1977), p. 105.

<sup>60</sup> *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. LXXXVI, Col. 924CD.

<sup>61</sup> The Non-Chalcedonians unite the wills and the energies of the Natures in a parallel way with the Natures, in which case they profess a composite will and energy parallel to their composite nature. In Aarhus they stated: "When we speak about one, we are always speaking about something united, not about a simple arithmetical monad" (Karekin Sarkissian, "The Doctrine of the Person of Christ in the Armenian Church," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2 [1964-1965], p. 120). In Bristol, again: "The will of Christ, then, is the will of man enriched by the will of God and the will of God united with the will of man. From this point of view, there are not two wills in the one Christ, but His will is that in which the will of God and the will of man find their absolute union" (V. C. Samuel, "The Manhood of Jesus Christ," *op. cit.*, p. 165).

<sup>62</sup> Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, *op. cit.*, p. 340.

<sup>63</sup> Karekin Sarkissian, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

<sup>64</sup> Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios, "Ecclesiological Issues Concerning the Relation of the Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches," in *Does Chalcedon Divide or Unite?*, p. 134.

<sup>65</sup> Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, *op. cit.*, p. 364.

<sup>66</sup> Panagiotes Chrestou, *Greek Patrology*, Vol. 5 (Thessaloniki: 1992), p. 107.

<sup>67</sup> *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. LXXXIX, Col. 108B.

<sup>68</sup> Saint John of Damascus, *On Heresies*, in *Greek Fathers of the Church* (1991), p. 282 (*Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, *op. cit.*, p. 310): "For every essence is common to all the hypostases contained by it, and it is not possible to find a particular and

individuating nature, that is, essence, since [if it were possible] it would be necessary to say that the same hypostases are both co-essential and different in essence and that the Holy Trinity is both co-essential and different in essence according to Divinity"; see also *Tome to the Bishop of Daraia, the Jacobite*, in Vol. 4 of *Greek Fathers of the Church* (Thessaloniki: 1990), p. 354.

<sup>69</sup> The word "entire" or "whole" should be understood as meaning "common nature," that is, not apportioned and individuated, and not as meaning "perfect," that is, without any lack of the elements that comprise it.

<sup>70</sup> Saint Gregory Palamas, *Synodal Tome*, 1.9.

<sup>71</sup> George Mantzarides, *Palamika* (Thessaloniki: 1973), pp. 166–170.

<sup>72</sup> V. C. Samuel, "Severus of Antioch," *op. cit.*, p. 157.

<sup>73</sup> Severius Zaka Iwas, "The Doctrine of One Nature in the Syrian Rites," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (1968), p. 315.

<sup>74</sup> Habte Mariam Worquineh, "The Mystery of the Incarnation," *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (1964–1965), p. 159.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 158.

<sup>77</sup> Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

<sup>78</sup> If the Divinity of Christ is possible by reason of the union, then Christ is not co-essential with the Father, because impassibility is an essential definition of Divinity. If, again, the Humanity of Christ is uncreated by reason of the union, then Christ is not co-essential with His Mother and with us, because being created is an essential definition of human nature. Consequently, they confess the twofold co-essentiality in mere name alone.

<sup>79</sup> The word "distinguished," which is used only by Severos, has a completely different meaning and purpose than the words "divided," "separated," "distanced," "apportioned," "distinguished from each other," "set forth in parts," "disunited," and "differ," which we encounter in the texts of Saint Cyril. In the book by Metropolitan Meletios of Nikopolis, *The Fifth Œcumenical Synod*, p. 589, n. 57, and in the book by George Martzelos, *Orthodox Dogma and Theological Speculation* (Thessaloniki: Pour-naras Publications, 1993), p. 173, n. 37, there is a host of passages from the Fathers with the words above that signify division and section, but in no passage does the word "distinguished" appear.

<sup>80</sup> "And just as the three Hypostases of the Holy Trinity are both unconfusedly united and indivisibly divided and enumerated, and the number does not create division, or separation, or alienation and disseverance, in the same way the Natures of Christ, although they are united, are yet unconfusedly united. Hence, they are enumerated, and the number does not introduce division" (Saint John of Damascus, *Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, *op. cit.*, p. 304).

<sup>81</sup> *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. xci, Col. 41B.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, Col. 44A.

<sup>84</sup> George D. Martzelos, "The Theological Presuppositions of the Passage from the Icon to the Prototype," *Epistemonike Epeteris tes Theologikes Scholes tou Panepistemiou tes Thessalonikes* (1992), pp. 505–518.

<sup>85</sup> *Patrologia Græca*, Vol. xcix, Col. 405AB.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, Col. 357A.

<sup>87</sup> We have been informed that while they preserve the Icons according to ancient Tradition, they do not accord them honorific veneration.